

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

26 January 2018

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Petrovic, I. (2016) 'The style and language of epigrammatic programmata.', in Dialect, diction, and style in Greek literary and inscribed epigram. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 391-414. Trends in classics. Supplementary volumes. (43).

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110498790-022>

Publisher's copyright statement:

The final publication is available at www.degruyter.com

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Ivana Petrovic

The Style and Language of Epigrammatic *Programmata*

Already in its Archaic inscriptional manifestations, epigram demonstrates a remarkable generic versatility and the ability to capture a variety of moods: some epigrams record individual or communal achievements, wealth, and piety, as we see them inscribed on splendid dedications and solemn grave monuments.¹ At the same time, they occur on cheap sympotic vessels, proclaiming ownership or extolling the joys of life – wine, sex, poetry, and humour.² The interest in the literary qualities of early inscriptional epigram has increased over the past two decades, but when it comes to Hellenistic and later epigram, it is the book epigram that often steals the show. Scholars often talk about the ‘transition of the epigram from stone into books’, but this is to side-line the fact that in the Hellenistic and Roman period, inscribed epigram not only continues to flourish, it explodes all over the Mediterranean world. Old genres such as dedications and epitaphs remain popular, but we also encounter a plethora of new sub-genres, such as deictic epigrams on statues, reliefs, paintings or mosaics and their occasional counterparts, epigrams commemorating the destruction of pagan statues;³ honorary inscriptions, building inscriptions and their cognates, mock-epigrams against those who envy the donors,⁴ signposts,⁵ praise of cities, prayers,⁶ veritable hymns, sympotic toasts,⁷ *gnomai*, and even epigrammatic sacred regulations. My paper looks into the style and content of epigrams as sacred regulations.

Greek sacred regulations first appear in the early 6th c. BC as brief prose inscriptions, which document and prescribe the rules of conduct in sanctuaries.⁸ From the Hellenistic period, these texts become more detailed, and we even encounter some metrical texts among them. The majority of metrical sacred regulations are hexameter texts.

1 See Day 2010 and the contributions in Baumbach/Petrovic/Petrovic 2010.

2 Arguably the most famous is the inscription on the so-called ‘Nestor’s cup’ *CEG* 454. On its possible early parallels, Wachter 2010.

3 Epigram on destruction of the statue of Artemis *SGO* 03/02/48, Ephesus, 400 AD.

4 *IG* 12.9.926, Euboea 2nd c. BC; *SGO* 02/08/01, Tabai in Caria, 4–5 c. AD.

5 *SGO* 01/01/03, 01/12/08, 13/04/01.

6 Prayer to Aphrodite, Ephesus *SGO* 03/02/40, 2–3 c. AD.

7 Graffito from Ephesus, *SGO* 03/02/45, 2–3 c. AD.

8 On the sacred regulations in general, Carbon/Pirenne-Delforge 2012 and Petrovic A. 2015.

In an article Andrej Petrovic and I published in 2006, we posited that metrical sacred regulations form a distinct class. We have investigated their language, spatial dispersion, and their physical context, in order to determine the source of authority vested in them. We could establish that the hexameter sacred regulations are, in almost all cases, Apolline oracular responses. The community would pose questions about the minutiae of ritual, or, in rare cases, would enquire about the best way to overcome a crisis. The oracular response of Apollo, issued in hexameters, would approve or reject the change of ritual, or, in times of crisis, the oracles would advise that a new deity be introduced, or that a new ritual involving already existing deities should be performed in order to help the community avert the crisis. Since these oracular responses regulate rituals and approve their change, they are classified as sacred regulations. As a divinity whose role was to mediate between the gods and men, Apollo was often consulted in all matters pertaining to the rituals, and his answers were perceived as invested with the highest possible authority. Communities decided to inscribe the original prophetic response in meter because this invested their sanctuary with the highest possible authority, and served as an indicator of its prestige and importance.

One particular group of sacred regulations addresses the issue of ritual purity.⁹ Ritual purity is a state different from profane, and a necessary prerequisite for entering the sacred space. This state of purity is usually obtained by temporal abstention from sources of pollution, such as birth, sex, or death, and by physical washing.¹⁰

Texts prescribing purity regulations of sanctuaries were, in antiquity, referred to as *programmata*, as a passage from Lucian's *On Sacrifices* demonstrates. Commenting on preparations for blood sacrifice, Lucian writes: 'the *programma* states that no-one is to pass the lustral basin who is not clean of hands'.¹¹ These texts were particularly concerned with the issues of access and the conditions under which was one deemed *hagnos*, 'pure' or in a fit state to gain access to a divinity.

Epigraphic records preserve around forty texts, which can be classed as cathartic entry regulations. The overwhelming majority is in prose.¹² However, there

⁹ On these texts, see Parker 1983, Chaniotis 1997 and 2012, Robertson 2013, and Petrovic/Petrovic 2016a.

¹⁰ Parker 1983. For an overview of recent literature, Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 1–40.

¹¹ 13: καὶ τὸ μὲν πρόγραμμα φησι μὴ παριέναι εἰς τὸ εἶσω τῶν περιφραντηρίων ὅστις μὴ καθαρὸς ἐστὶν τὰς χεῖρας. On *programmata*, Petrovic/Petrovic 2006 and 2016, 281–8 with bibliography.

¹² For a full dossier, Petrovic/Petrovic 2016a.

also exists a small collection of cathartic regulations in elegiac distichs. These epigrammatic *programmata* are the focus of this paper.

The earliest inscriptionally attested *programma* in meter is from Phaistos in Crete:¹³

θαῦμα μέγ' ἀνθρώποις | πάντων Μάτηρ προδίκνυτι |
 τοῖς ὁσίοις κίνηρητι καὶ οἱ γονεῶν ὑπέχονται·
 τοῖς δὲ παρεσβαίνονσι θιῶν γένιος ἀντία πράτει. *vacat*
 πάντες δ' εὐσεβίης τε καὶ εὐγλωθιοὶ πάριθ' ἄγνοι *vacat*
 ἔνθεον ἑς | Μεγάλας Ματρὸς ναόν, | ἔνθεα δ' ἔργα
 γνωσῆ[θ]' ἀθανάτας ἄξια τῷδε ν|αῶ. *vacat*

I.Cret. 1.23.3; *SEG* 50.933 bis; 44.731 bis; Pugliese Carratelli 2001, 86–7; Bernabé 2005, 135–6 Fr. 568F; Martínez Fernández 2006, 155–64 no. 23; Tzifopoulos 2010, 41–3 no. 17.

This inscription is without doubt Hellenistic, but the exact dating has proven difficult. Guarducci suggested second century BC, but the most recent editor of this text remarked that ‘the later third or the early first centuries should not be excluded’.¹⁴ The text, however, may well be older than the stone, if this inscription is actually a republication.¹⁵ The text was inscribed on a *tabula ansata*, which was very probably affixed on the doors of the sanctuary.¹⁶

The first four lines are in hexameter, and the last two lines form an elegiac distich. This metrical irregularity occurs in verse inscriptions from the early instances. It is difficult to ascertain a pattern when hexameters are combined with apparently random pentameters, though Hunter remarks that there is a tendency to close a sequence of hexameters with a pentameter.¹⁷

As Tzifopoulos notes, this epigram is divided into three parts both by the spaces which were left intentionally empty on the stone, and by the shift of the voice and meter (1–3:4:5–6).¹⁸ The empty spaces on the stone are the end of the third hexameter (after *πράτει*) and at the end of the fourth hexameter (after *ἄγνοι*). In addition, the shift of voice places the emphasis on the fourth hexameter, which provides information about the ways of obtaining ritual purity. Lines five and six are separated from the rest of the poem with an empty space, and they form an elegiac distich. This metrical change represents a shift in both

¹³ Text: Martínez Fernández 2006, no. 23.

¹⁴ Tzifopoulos 2010, 42. For an overview of various dating suggestions, see Martínez Fernández 2006, 155.

¹⁵ As suggested by Levi 1921, 371.

¹⁶ Halbherr 1890, 736.

¹⁷ Hunter forthcoming.

¹⁸ Tzifopoulos 2010, 206.

style and the content. After this reading, the first three lines explain the nature of the goddess; the fourth line is a direct address of the visitor and provides information about obtaining of ritual purity, whereas the elegiac distich provides information about the rituals performed in the temple.

The inscription is in the Cretan dialect,¹⁹ which could indicate that the text itself is older than the inscription. However, the use of the Cretan dialect may also represent an attempt to ‘archaize’ the sacred regulation and thus invest it with religious authority.²⁰

The meaning of the second part of the epigram is clear. It addresses the visitors of the sanctuary of Magna Mater directly, inviting them to enter in a pure state. However, what is exceptional about this request is that ritual purity is not defined as temporal abstinence from polluting matter or events, or as a result of washing, but as piety and reverent speech.²¹ Line four, πάντες δ’ εὐσεβίες τε καὶ εὐγλωθιοι clearly redefines ritual purity as a state of mind (piety) and speaking ‘good’ words, that is, words of good omen. *euglossia* is the equivalent of a better known religious term, *euphemia*, which denotes religious and reverent speech or silence.²²

The first three lines of the poem, however, present significant linguistic and interpretative difficulties. The name of the goddess who holds the sanctuary follows the inverted but easily recognizable Homeric formula μέγα θαῦμα,²³ and the verb προδίκνυτι, a third person singular present of προδείκνυμι ‘show by example, foreshow’ which demonstrates the athematic ending -τι typical for the Cretan dialect (like κίνχηρητι in the following verse). The precise meaning of the verb in this context has been subject to debate.²⁴ It is possible that the ‘great wonder’ displayed in the temple pertains to oracles, in which case the verb προδίκνυτι would mean ‘performs’, as recently argued by Tzifopoulos.²⁵

The second verse presents the most challenging interpretative difficulties. The phrase οἱ γονεῶν ὑπέχονται has been variously understood as a reference to the local ritual taurobolia; as pertaining to parents in general, mothers, those who

¹⁹ For a detailed discussion, Martínez Fernández 2006, 161. On the influence of koine at Crete, Bubenik 1989, 79–90.

²⁰ Bile 1988, 227, n. 298.

²¹ On the inner purity in Greek religion, see now Petrovic/Petrovic 2016.

²² On euphemia, Gödde 2011.

²³ See the commentary in Martínez Fernández 2006, 161–2. It is worth noting that θαῦμα μέγα does actually occur once in the early epic poetry (*SH* 218) and is also attested in inscriptional epigrams: once on Crete (*I.Cret.* 1.17.21) and twice in single grave inscription from Miletupolis (*SGO* 08/05/08, l. 4).

²⁴ For an overview of all interpretations proposed thus far, Martínez Fernández 2006, 156–61.

²⁵ Tzifopoulos 2010, 205.

are about to give birth, or those who shall receive the gift of children from Magna Mater; those who promise interest; those who can demonstrate their divine ancestors or have secretly been adopted into the race of the gods.²⁶ The only thing that is clear about the second verse is that one cannot make any definitive conclusions about its meaning without knowing more about the nature of the sanctuary in question. The text has often been interpreted as in some way connected with ‘Orphism’, which has lead various scholars to conclude that the rituals performed in the sanctuary were mystery initiations and revelations.²⁷

Be that as it may, the ‘great wonder’ in the first line, combined with *προδείκνυμι* and *κίνχητι* (= *χρηζει*) in the second line strongly suggests oracular activity, so that one may tentatively translate the epigram as follows:

Mother of all displays a great wonder to humans,
she issues prophecies to those who are the religiously correct (*hosioi*)²⁸ and those who are raising children (?)
but to those who transgress, the divine race does the opposite.
All who are pious and good-of-tongue, proceed in as pure
into the temple of the Great Mother where the goddess dwells, and divine deeds
you will get to know in this temple, (deeds) worthy of the immortal (goddess).

In the first three lines, there is no direct address of the visitors, the mode of narration is impersonal (in the third person) and the statement moves from the particular (l. 1: ‘Mother of all displays a great wonder to humans’) to a general statement regarding the nature of all gods (l. 3: *θιῶν γένος*): the gods punish those who transgress. Rather remarkably for a local sanctuary, the inscription seems to envisage a reader who does not know what sanctuary he has approached. Greek sacred regulations are almost always envisage a local audience, and provide only the most necessary information, such as the duration of usual abstentions and the means of washing. This one, on the contrary, represents the god-

²⁶ For a detailed and critical discussion of various interpretations proposed, Martínez Fernández 2006, 156–61.

²⁷ Tzifopoulos 2010, 207–8 follows this line of argument and offers an overview of scholarship, concluding (p. 208): ‘Magna Mater, inside her god-inspiring temple, reveals the only god-inspiring deeds that count. She pronounces *‘the oracle’* of life and death answering the awe-inspiring question ‘what happens when humans die?’ (italics in original).

²⁸ The meaning and the etymology of *hosios* and its substantive *hosiotes* have been objects of lively scholarly discussion. Peels 2014 offers a thorough semantic analysis with bibliography and concludes that ‘*ὅσιος* is what humans do to please the gods and gives them the τιμή they deserve, or anything of which the speaker can convince others that it belongs to that category’ (p. 245). I follow Mikalson’s 2010: 11–12; 140–54 interpretation and translation of the term: ‘religiously correct’.

dess as serving the whole of humanity, and qualifies her as able to carefully examine the inner state of mind of every visitor, distinguishing between the *hosioi*, the pious ones, and the transgressors (l. 3: τοῖς δὲ παρεσβαίνονσι), and helping the pious, while punishing the rest. Having so introduced the wondrous powers of Magna Mater, the inscription shifts to a direct address to the visitors. I find it particularly interesting that the shift from the impersonal to the personal address is accompanied by a shift in meter, as we see a shift from a hexameter at the beginning, to the elegiac distich at the end of the text.

Let us consider another metrical cathartic regulation from Euromos in Caria. The epigram is dated in the second century AD;²⁹ it is an entry and kathartic regulation for the precinct of Zeus Lepsi(y)nos (Λέψινος / Λέψυνος)³⁰ that was probably placed on one of the doorposts of the temple.³¹

Εἰ καθαράν, ὦ ξεῖνε, φέρεις φρένα καὶ τὸ δίκαι[ι]ον
ἥσκηκες ψυχῇ, βαῖνε κατ' εὐίερον· *vacat*
εἰ δ' ἀδίκων ψαύεις καὶ σοι | νόος οὐ καθαρεύει, |
πόρρω ἀπ' ἀθανάτων | [ἔ]ργεο καὶ τεμένους· |
οὐ στέργει φαύλους | [ι]ερὸς δόμος, ἀλλὰ κολλάζει, *vacat*
τοῖς δ' ὁσίοις | [ό]σίους ἀντινέμε[ι] | χάριτας]

Errington 1993, 29–30 nr. 8; Voutiras 1995, 15–19, *SEG* 43.710; *SGO* 01/17/01

If you bring a pure mind, stranger, and if in your soul justice
you have practiced, come to this place of sanctity.
But, if you engage with the unjust and if your mind is not pure,
off with you from the gods' ritual and sanctuary.
The holy house has no love for the villains, it castigates them,
but to those who are religiously correct it bestows equal thanks (?).

29 Errington 1993, 29 dates it in the second century BC on the basis of the letter forms; Voutiras 1995, 18–19 dates it in the late first century AD based on the letter forms and on the assumption that the metrical inscriptions from Greek sanctuaries which demand inner purity are from the Roman period, which is not correct, cf. the inscription from Crete discussed above and the inscriptions from the sanctuary of Asclepius in Epidaurus, below. Voutiras 1995 adduces *LSCG* Suppl. 59, 91 and 108, and the inscription from Epidaurus ('angeblich aus dem Asklepiostempel von Epidauros', p. 16) as parallels. Voutiras 1998, 148 corrects his 1995 dating: If the inscription really was placed on one of the doorposts of the Zeus temple (see note 31), then it must be from the Hadrianic period, since this is when the temple was erected.

30 Both forms of the epithet are attested.

31 According to Errington 1993, 29, it was inscribed on a boundary stone; Voutiras 1995, 14 notes that the content of the inscription does not correspond to other horoi inscriptions, and, on the basis of the photo of the squeeze provided by Errington 1993 nr. 8, plate 6, as well as on the basis of the kathartic content of inscription and the mention of ἱερὸς δόμος in l. 5, Voutiras 1995, 19 suggests that it was inscribed on one of the doorposts of the Zeus temple.

This epigram is composed in a literary Ionic dialect.³² It consists of three elegiac distichs. Like the last distich of the Magna Mater inscription, this epigram from Euromos also addresses the visitor in the second person. Whereas the context of the Cretan poem implies that the visitor has no prior knowledge of the sanctuary, this one is much clearer and addresses the visitor as ‘stranger’ already in the first line: ὦ ξεῖνε. Here, too, the cathartic regulation focuses entirely on the inner state of the visitor: Εἰ καθαρὰν... φέρεις φρένα – ‘if you bring a pure mind’, then enter. Furthermore, purity is defined as not merely a momentary state of the mind, but as a continuous effort to ‘practice justice in one’s soul’ (vv. 1–2 δίκαι[ι]ον ἡσκηκες ψυχῇ). Only those of pure mind will be allowed entry, while those who ‘touch’ or ‘engage with the unjust’ (v. 3) and do not have a pure mind must ‘stay away from the gods’ ritual and sanctuary’ (v. 4). Like in the Cretan inscription, here, too, we encounter the opposition between the pious visitors who will be rewarded and the impious, who will be punished by the gods. This opposition is not only evident on the basis of the content, but also on the basis of the lettering: There are two intentionally empty spaces of one letter each between verses 2–3 and 5–6. This detail was not registered or commented upon by the editors of the inscription, but the spaces are clearly visible on the photo of the squeeze. Intriguingly, the internal division which the empty spaces indicate is between the inwardly pure (vv. 1–2 and 6) and the inwardly impure (vv. 3–5), so that the gaps in lettering actually create a spatial boundary between the two classes of people. They separate the two, just like the gods are able to distinguish between the inwardly pure and impure visitors, and reward the former while expelling and punishing the latter. This motif is yet another departure from conventional sacred regulations that consider entry to sanctuaries: They almost always focus on the concrete requirements which need to be fulfilled and do not tend to dwell on punishments for transgressors. It seems that this epigram also envisages a visitor who is not acquainted with the sanctuary, not the local audience, and focuses on the inner purity instead of the purity of body.

The juxtaposition between the pure and the inwardly impure (l.5: φαύλους) in a similar manner is attested in an epigram which is not securely dated,³³ and comes from the sanctuary of Zeus in Panamara, also in Caria, and not far from

³² The form ἔ]πγειο in line 4 is clearly readable on the stone; this is presumably genitive singular of ἔργον. Both ἔργου and ἔργοιο are attested in early epic poetry, but ἔπγειο has no parallels in Greek literature or inscriptions.

³³ The first editor Hatzfeld 1927 noted that the inscription ‘est d’une écriture plus tardive’ (p. 120).

Euromos, some 30 miles to the East as the crow flies. This epigram was inscribed on the basis of the statue of Athena:³⁴

ἡ φαύλοις μὲν ἔχω χέρ' ἀμίλιχον· εἰ δέ τις ἀ[γνὸς]
τιμώη, κραδάω τοῦδ' ὕπερ αἰγανέην.

Hatzfeld, *BCH* 51, 1927, 120 Nr 136a, *SEG* 4.385a, Roussel, *REG* 41, 1928, 380, Wilhelm 1980, 28 nr. 32, *SEG* 30.1277, I.Stratonikeia 41a, *SGO* 02/06/01

My hand is relentless towards the bad, but if someone pure
venerates me, I defend him by brandishing my spear.

The epigram belongs to the 'speaking statue' type, and even though the statue itself has not been preserved, it is attractive to imagine it as Athena Promachos.

In addition to the purity of mind which is requested in line one, the inscription from Euromos also requests that the visitors 'practice justice in their soul' (ll. 1–2). Whereas the request for inner purity is first attested in Hesiod, and has a long history in various literary genres and in the philosophical tradition,³⁵ the request for practicing justice and the juxtaposition of the just and unjust with respect to gaining entry to the sacred precinct is less well attested.³⁶ However, there is a passage in Euripides' *Ion* where the eponymous hero distinguishes between the just and the unjust worshippers. Furthermore, *Ion* does this in the context of his notorious critique of sacred regulations (1312–19):

δεινόν γε, θνητοῖς τοὺς νόμους ὡς οὐ καλῶς
ἔθηκεν ὁ θεὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ γνώμης σοφῆς·
τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἀδίκους βωμὸν οὐχ ἵζειν ἔχρῃν
ἀλλ' ἐξελαύνειν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ψαύειν καλὸν
θεῶν πονηρᾷ χειρὶ, τοῖσι δ' ἐνδίκους
ἱερὰ καθίζειν <δ> ὅστις ἡδικεῖτ' ἔχρῃν,
καὶ μὴ 'πὶ ταῦτ' ἰόντ' ἔχειν ἴσον
τόν τ' ἐσθλὸν ὄντα τόν τε μὴ θεῶν πάρα.

1315

³⁴ This is relatively clear from the second epigram (I.Stratonikeia 41 b), which was inscribed underneath, and is only fragmentarily preserved; however, in line 2, the words Διὸς κούρην τῆνδ are legible.

³⁵ Petrovic/Petrovic 2016.

³⁶ Diodorus Siculus 10.9.6 testifies that Pythagoras requested that those performing sacrifices should approach the gods with a 'ritually pure soul' and a body 'clean from every deed of injustice'. See on this Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 55–66. *LSAM* 29, a 4th c. BC sacred regulation from the sanctuary of Mater Galleia from Metropolis in Ionia combines the usual regulations regarding bodily purity with a request to abstain from 'unjust deeds'. On this inscription and the motif of justice in the sacred regulations, Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 282.

It is monstrous how bad and unintelligent are the laws the god has made for mortals! He ought not to let the wicked sit at his altar but drive them away. It is not right for an evil hand to touch the gods but only a righteous one. Those who are wronged should be given a seat: just and unjust should not come to the same place and receive the same treatment from the gods.³⁷

As Mikalson points out, taken out of context, Ion's words are scandalous, because they attack the holy institution of asylum, but in the context of the tragedy, it is precisely the inviolability of asylum that saves Ion from unwittingly killing his own mother.³⁸ The passage demonstrates a remarkable set of similarities with the Euromos epigram: Essentially, it protests against allowing the unjust (ἀδίκους) to enter the sanctuary and to touch (ψάειν) the sacred objects with their evil hand (πονηρᾷ χειρί). Only the just (ἐνδίκους) should be allowed this privilege, and the unjust should be chased away (ἐξελαύνειν) from the sanctuary. Furthermore, it is wrong that the good and the bad (τόν τ' ἐσθλὸν ὄντα τόν τε μὴ) should be treated in the same way by the gods (ἔχουσιν ἴσον ... θεῶν πάρα). The Euromos inscription reads like a direct reply to Ion's words: The gods do indeed distinguish between the just and the unjust, they chase away the bad and bestow equal thanks only to the good.

Finally, in the Euromos text, like in the Cretan inscription, we encounter the interplay between the general and the specific: the statement in ll. 3–4: εἰ δ' ἀδίκων ψαύεις καὶ σοι νόος οὐ καθαρεύει, / πόρρω ἀπ' ἀθανάτων | [ἔ]ργεο καὶ τεμένους does not merely pertain to this specific sanctuary and its divinity, but to the general behaviour of all gods and the requirements for all sanctuaries – note the plural in πόρρω ἀπ' ἀθανάτων | [ἔ]ργεο καὶ τεμένους. Then the inscription turns to the specific sanctuary and speaks on behalf of the holy house (note v. 5 [ἰ]ερὸς δόμος), which can be taken as a deictic, since the inscription was probably fixed at the very entry of the sanctuary.³⁹

Let us now consider the epigram from the sanctuary of the deity Psithyros ('to whom one whispers' or 'Whisperer') from Lindos:

τῷ Ψιθύρῳ νηὸν πολυκείονα τεῦξε Σέλευκος
κοσμήσας αὐτὸν ὥσπερ ἐχρημάτισεν·
χρῆσεν καὶ θύιν οἷς καὶ τὸ συνειδὸς ἄριστον
καὶ τειμᾶν δραχμῇ ἥττονι δ' οὐκ ἐθέλειν,
καὶ τοῦτω χρῆσθαι προσέτος εἰς νηὸν Ἀθήνης,
δώσιν γὰρ πράξεις τοῖσι θύουσι καλάς.

³⁷ Text and translation: Kovacs 1999.

³⁸ Mikalson 1991, 75–6.

³⁹ Voutiras 1995, 19.

Seleukos built a temple of many columns for Psithyros
and adorned it as he was instructed in a dream.

He also declared that the sacrifices be conducted by those of the best (sc. clear) conscience
and that he would not appreciate the honour lesser than a drachma.

The visitors⁴⁰ of Athena's temple should visit this one, too,
because those who sacrifice will be given fair favours.

I.Lindos 2.484

This inscription is dated to the third century AD and was probably placed at the entrance to the shrine of a deity called Psithyros, which was in the immediate vicinity of the temple of Athena Lindia. Each verse of the poem is inscribed in a separate line. The dialect is koine, with occasional Doric colouring.

A certain Seleukos dedicated a shrine to this deity, presumably because he was instructed to do so in a dream. The epigram can be classified amongst the dedicatory, since it mentions the occasion and the reason of the dedication of the shrine, but it is also a sacred regulation, since it outlines the service for the god, and a cathartic entry regulation, since this inscription also highlights the importance of the state of mind as a necessary prerequisite for a successful visit to the sanctuary.

Here again we encounter an emphasis on inner purity in line 3: *χρῆσεν καὶ θύιν οἷς καὶ τὸ συνειδὸς ἄριστον* and, at the end of the text, the motif of divine reciprocity, just as in the Cretan and the Carian examples: *δώσιν γὰρ πράξεις τοῖσι θύουσι καλὰς* (l. 6). However, there is no direct address of the worshippers, and the form of the epigram seems to be significantly influenced by its dedicatory occasion.

Unfortunately, we don't know much about Psithyros as a deity,⁴¹ but we do know quite a bit about the sanctuary of Athena in its immediate vicinity, which is referenced in the penultimate line of the epigram. The temple of the Lindian Athena was very famous.⁴² This sanctuary boasts one of the longest and the most interesting extant purity regulations, where the prose text is

⁴⁰ Usener 1904, 623 argues that *προσέτος* should be grasped as accusative plural (= *προσέτους*) with the preservation of the Doric ending *-ος*.

⁴¹ Usener 1904 suggests that the god was an intermediary between the Lindian Athena and her worshippers who for the gift of a drachma listened to the prayers of Athena's worshippers and provided assistance in transmitting them to the goddess. The epithet Psithyros is attested for Aphrodite and Eros at Athens, where Hermes Psithyrastes also had a cult, see on this Radke 1958, 1958a.

⁴² On the sanctuary: Dyggve/Poulsen 1960; Kähler 1971; Lippolis 1988–1989; Wriedt Sørensen/Pentz 1992, Petrovic/Petrovic 2016a. Higbie 2003 provides a discussion of the sanctuary's local history as documented by the first c. BC Lindian *anagraphē*.

combined with an epigram, and the bodily and mental purity go hand-in-hand:

[κα]θαρο[ὺ]ς π[α]ρίναι κατὰ ὑποκείμενα]
 [π]εριφαντηρίων εἴσω καὶ τῶν τοῦ ναοῦ [πυλῶν] ·
 [ἴ]ναι ὅσιον φειδομένους ὀράσεως τέκνων βδ[ι]αλλόντων]
 [ἀ]πὸ παντὸς ἐναγοῦς, ἀνάγνου, ἀθέσμου, μὴ τὸ [σῶ]-
 μα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κεκαθαρμένου[ς] 5
 [ὅ]πλα ἀρήια μὴ φέροντας
 αἰσθητὰς καθαρὰς ἔχοντας χωρὶς ἐπικρανίων
 ἀνυποδέτους ἢ ἐν λευκοῖς μὴ αἰγείοις ὑποδήμασι
 μηδὲ τι αἶγιον ἔχοντας
 μηδὲ ἐν ζώναις ἄμματα 10
 [ἀ]πὸ φθορᾶς γυναικὸς ἢ κυνὸς ἢ ὄνου ἡμε(ρῶν) μ[α']
 [ἀ]πὸ διακορεύσεως μ[α']
 [ἀ]πὸ κήδους οἰκίου μ[α']
 [ἀ]πὸ λ[ο]ύσεως κήδους ζ ἀπὸ ἰσόδου γ
 [ἀ]πὸ λέχους γ λεχῶ κα' 15
 [ἀ]πὸ [κ]ατ[α]μηνία[ς] γυνῆ σημαμένη
 ἀπὸ [συ]νο[υ]σί[ας] λουσάμενος ἢ ἀγνισάμ[ενος]
 ἀπὸ κο[ι]νῆ[ς] ἡμ(ερῶν) α
 ἀπὸ τῶν παρανόμων οὐδέποτε καθαρὸ[ς]
 ἱερεῖς, μολποί, μουσικοί, ὕμνωδοί, ὑπηρέται, ἀπ[ὸ]
 τῶν ἀκουσίων πάντοτε καθαροί, τῷ ἱερῷ καθαρίσιν
vacat χρώμενοι. *vacat*
 τὰν ποτ' Ὀλυμπον ἔβας ἀρεταφόρον εἴσιθι· τοιγὰρ
 εἰ καθαρὸς βαίνεις, *vacat* ὧ ᾧ ξένε, θαρραλέως,
 εἰ δέ τι πᾶμα φέρις, τὸν ἀπάμονα κάλλιπε ναόν· 25
 στείχε δ' ὅπα χρήζεις Παλλάδος ἐκ τεμένους.

Visitors may proceed as pure according to the regulations
 within the lustral basins and the gates of the temple:
 let them enter piously, abstaining from looking at [breast-fed?] children,
 purified from causes of divine wrath, from causes of pollution and transgression,
 not only in respect to their body, but also to their soul. 5
 They are not to carry iron weapons.
 They are to wear pure clothes, without head-gear.
 Without shoes, or in white sandals, but not made of goat skin.
 One should have nothing goat-y.
 One should have no knots in one's belts. 10
 After miscarriage by a woman, or a bitch, or an ass, 41 days.
 After defloration, 41 days.
 After death of a member of the household, 41 days.
 After washing of the corpse, seven days. After a visit (of the house of a deceased
 person), three days.
 After [contact with] a woman

who has delivered a child, three days. A woman who has delivered a child,
 21 days. 15
 After [menstruati]on, after the woman has cleansed herself.
 After sex, after one has washed or cleansed himself.
 After [sex with] a prostitute, one day.
 After things unlawful, one is never pure.
 Priests, singers, musicians, performers of hymns, temple attendants, 20
 after involuntary [pollution], are always pure after sacred purifier's
 application.
 You have trodden the virtue-bringing path toward Olympus, so enter-
 If you are coming pure, stranger, then enter with confidence,
 but if you are carrying blame with you, leave the blameless temple – 25
 go wherever you want, but stay away from Athena's precinct.

*I.Lindos 2.487 = LSCG Suppl. 91*⁴³

The inscription is dated in late second or early third century AD, but, as Andrej Petrovic and I argue in our forthcoming paper on this inscription,⁴⁴ it is very probably a republication of at least two inscriptions, prose and verse, which were initially published separately. The inscription was placed at the entrance to the *propylaea* of the temenos of Athena Lindia. The initial lines of the prose regulation mention both purity of mind and body, and the text ends with an epigram extolling the importance of the purity of mind.

In terms of layout, the final word of the prose text, l. 22 *χρῶμενοι*, is inscribed in larger letters and at the centre of the line, signalling with its position and the empty spaces on its both sides a transition from prose to the two elegiac distichs of ll. 23–26. Each line of the epigram is inscribed separately. In the epigram itself, empty space in the first line of the pentameter draws the readers' attention to the key message of the text – 'if you come pure – *vacat*– then, stranger, with confidence' ...

As we have seen, the other metrical programmata were inscribed individually. Only one other extant text combines a metrical *programma* with a regulation in prose, the 1st c. AD entry and cathartic regulation of the sanctuary of Sarapis, notably also from Rhodes.⁴⁵ That text is inscribed in such a way that prose and meter are completely merged together, and there is no visual indication that an elegiac distich has been inserted between a list of *hagneiai* and the section detailing rules for sacrificial ritual.

⁴³ For a full discussion of the text and epigraphic comments, Petrovic/Petrovic 2016a.

⁴⁴ Petrovic/Petrovic 2016a.

⁴⁵ LSCG Suppl. 108. For the image, see Accame 1938, fig. XLVI. On this text, see below and Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 285.

The epigram from the sanctuary of Athena which closes the long and detailed sacred regulation picks up on the motif of inner purity from the prose part of the text (l. 5–6: μή τὸ [σῶ]μα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κεκαθαρμένου[ς]) and reiterates the request in an elevated and poetic tone. The prose and verse text are markedly different in respect to style and language. Whereas the prose inscription is composed in koine, the verse text demonstrates the long Doric -α- throughout and uses the Doric ποτί for πρός. In his pioneering study of the influence of koine on Rhodes, Thumb demonstrated that the Rhodian inscriptions preserve the local dialect for a remarkably long period of time, well into the Roman period, and that the long Doric -α- is one of the most persistent hallmarks of the Doric dialect on Rhodes.⁴⁶ Since the inscription itself is dated to the second or third c. AD, when Doric dialect was occasionally still used for Rhodian inscriptions, the language of the metrical inscription is not striking per se, but the dialectal differences between the prose and the verse raise some questions. If the inscription is a republication of two old inscriptions which were initially published separately, perhaps an effort was made to preserve the language of the verse inscription, whereas the prose regulation was probably koneized. The contrast between the verse part of this inscription with the almost completely koineized dedicatory inscription from the shrine of Psythiros in its immediate vicinity, which is also dated in the third century AD, could be a further indication that the epigram composed for the shrine of Athena is older and that its preserved inscriptional text is in fact a republication.

The epigram demonstrates a set of similarities with other epigrammatic *programmata*. Here, too, the visitor of the sanctuary is addressed directly, like in the inscriptions from Phaistos and Euromos, and as stranger (l. 24: ὦ ξένε), like in the inscription from Euromos. The poetic words πᾶμα and ἀπάμονα (l. 25) place an emphasis on the inner purity / impurity, like all other metrical *programmata*. Like in the other *programmata*, a differentiation is made between the inwardly pure, who are allowed to enter, and the impure, who are ordered to leave the precinct.

The words πᾶμα and ἀπάμονα merit closer attention. They are both instances of Doric hypercorrection. πῆμα is a poetic word, frequently attested in literature since Homer, and it occurs in the inscriptional epigrams as well, but the version πᾶμα for ‘misery, calamity’ is not attested anywhere else. This cannot be an ar-

⁴⁶ Thumb 1901, 38–46, esp. table on p. 39, which provides an overview of the ratio of Doric vs. koine inscriptions on Rhodes (in the Hellenistic period, 93% of Rhodian inscriptions are composed in Doric dialect, in the 1–2 c AD 77%, and in 3–5 c AD, 39%). See also Bubenik 1989, 94–195.

chaic Rhodian form of the word, either, since its cognate, *πημαίνω* is attested in a grave inscription from the early 6th c BC found near Kameiros.⁴⁷

The sanctuary of Athena Lindia is situated on a cliff some hundred and sixteen meters above the coastline and the ascent to it is difficult and steep, which is probably the reason why it is compared to the ‘virtuous path to Olympus’ in line 23. In some inscriptional grave epigrams, we encounter the ‘ascent towards Olympus’ as a euphemism for death.⁴⁸ Whereas in the grave epigrams, the journey to Olympus often includes the implicit or explicit separation of the soul from the body, in this epigram, the adjective *ἀρεταφόρος* indicates a different type of separation, that of the virtuous from the bad. In my opinion, the virtuous road towards Olympus, *ἀρεταφόρος* (sc. *ὁδός*) is an allusion to the famous and often quoted parable about the two roads, one leading to excellence (*ἀρετή*) and the other to moral badness (*κακότης*) from Hesiod’s *Works and Days*. These lines have been quoted twenty-six times in extant literature dating from 700 BC to AD 300 as a supreme illustration of morality, and were one of Hesiod’s best-known passages.⁴⁹

τὴν μὲν τοι Κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἐλέσθαι
 ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ’ ἐγγύθι ναίει·
 τῆς δ’ Ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν
 ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν
 καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὶν δ’ εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,
 ῥηιδίῃ δῆπαιτα πέλει, χαλεπὴ περ ἐοῦσα.

290

Misery is there to be grabbed in abundance,
 easily, for smooth is the road, and she lives very nearby;
 but in front of Excellence the immortal gods have set sweat,
 and the path to her is long and steep,
 and rough at first—yet when one arrives at the top,
 then it becomes easy, difficult though it still is.⁵⁰

These Hesiodic lines fit the context of our inscription well, both as a moral instruction, and taken literally: In the prose part of the inscription, the moral excellence of the visitor constitutes one of the entry requirements for the sanctuary (ll. 4–5: ‘purified from causes of divine wrath, from causes of pollution and transgression, not only in respect to their body, but also to their soul’). On the

⁴⁷ IG 12.1.737 = SEG 26.865 l. 6: *πημαῖνοι*.

⁴⁸ GVI 1773 and 1830; IG 2.2.12318 and 13088; IG 9.1.4.1024; IG 14. 2002; SGO 01/20/29; TAM 5. 1. 615. On this motif, Obryk 2012 *passim*.

⁴⁹ Koning 2010, 144–9.

⁵⁰ Text and translation: Most 2006.

other hand, the road towards the sanctuary of Athena is indeed extremely steep and rough at first, but when one arrives at the top of the terraced acropolis, the road not only becomes easier, even a modern traveller is richly rewarded by a spectacular vista. It must have been quite a sight in its heyday, when all its sacred buildings were still standing and the rich dedications were in situ.

It is the life-long striving towards excellence that renders one pure, whereas those carrying blame (πᾶμα) should stay away from the sanctuary of Athena. If the reference to ἀρεταφόρος (ὁδός) does invoke Hesiod's *Works and Days*, a visitor of the Lindian sanctuary well versed in Hesiod might also recall the passage from the same poem, which preceds the one quoted above, where πῆμα is explicitly associated with both inner impurity and divine punishment (238–47):

οἷς δ' ὕβρις τε μέμηλε κακὴ καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
τοῖς δὲ δίκην Κρονίδης τεκμαίρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς.
πολλάκι καὶ ξύμπασα πόλις κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀπηύρα, 240
ὅστις ἀλιτράινει καὶ ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάται.
τοῖσιν δ' οὐρανόθεν μέγ' ἐπήγαγε πῆμα Κρονίων,
λιμὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ λοιμόν· ἀποφθινύθουσι δὲ λαοί·
οὐδὲ γυναικες τίκτουσιν, μινύθουσι δὲ οἴκοι
Ζηνὸς φραδμοσύνησιν Ὀλυμπίου· ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε 245
ἢ τῶν γε στρατὸν εὐρὺν ἀπώλεσεν ὃ γε τεῖχος
ἢ νέας ἐν πόντῳ Κρονίδης ἀποτείνονται αὐτῶν.

But to those who care only for evil outrageousness and cruel deeds,
far-seeing Zeus, Cronus' son, marks out justice.
Often even a whole city suffers because of an evil man
who sins and devises wicked deeds.
Upon them, Cronus' son brings forth woe from the sky,
famine together with pestilence, and the people die away;
the women do not give birth, and the households are diminished
by the plans of Olympian Zeus. And at another time
Cronus' son destroys their broad army or their wall,
or he takes vengeance upon their ships on the sea.⁵¹

In this passage, Hesiod famously expands on the idea that the consequences of hubristic behaviour, far from being limited to the individual perpetrator, affect his entire community. Zeus' punishment (πῆμα) for the bad man is *loimos*, a complex and all-encompassing pollution, which spreads from the perpetrator to his entire community.⁵² In the Lindian epigram, πᾶμα represents the inner pol-

⁵¹ Text and translation: Most 2006.

⁵² On *loimos* as pollution and divine punishment encompassing a whole complex of disasters, including fatal disease, failure of crops, and death in childbirth, see Parker 1983: 257–8. At

lution of the individual. However, in the prose part of the inscription, inner pollution is explicitly associated with divine wrath, as the state of inner purity is explained as (l. 4): [ἀ]πὸ παντὸς ἐναγοῦς, ‘free from divine wrath’, which means not being in the grip of divine *agos*. Generally, *agos* denotes the ‘attention of the divine’, which can be both positive and negative, but it is most commonly used of divine anger as a consequence of a human transgression. According to Parker, *agos* is a form of pollution which ‘has its source in a sacrilegious act, and the *enagēs*, as the attached genitive suggests, is in the grip of an avenging power; the reason for avoiding him is (...) to escape being engulfed in the divine punishment that awaits him.’⁵³

Whereas the prose inscription painstakingly enumerates the sources of pollution and the manners of purification, the verse inscription picks up on the motif of inner pollution and portrays the temple of Athena as ἀπάμων, ‘blameless’. It is worth noting that this temple was famous for the soteriological epiphanies of the goddess Athena, who, according to a local inscription, tended to appear to the prominent citizens in a dream and help the city in the times of need.⁵⁴ We have seen that the temple of Magna Mater in the Phaistos inscription is designated as ἔνθεον (l. 5), which suggests epiphanic divine presence, and that it is possible that the deity venerated in it issued oracles. The Lindian deity Psithyros appeared to Seleukos in a dream, and the inscription suggests that he, too, is constantly inhabiting his temple, and assisting the visitors of his more prominent neighbour, Lindian Athena. We do not know much about the possible oracular or epiphanic activity of Zeus Lepsi(y)nos from Euromos, but the epigram certainly suggests that the deity closely monitors the visitors of his temple, and distinguishes between the just and the unjust.

It seems that a number of inscriptionally attested metrical programmata display a set of common characteristics, even though they are geographically and temporally wide-spread: direct address of the visitor, the characterization of the visitor as foreigner, a request for inner purity, with the option of divine punishment of the inwardly impure, as well as some form of divine epiphany. These are, however, not the only specimens of the genre. Three further programmata have been transmitted in literary sources,⁵⁵ and these texts are associated with

pp. 257–80 Parker discusses the collective punishment for the miasma of the individual at length. On purity in Hesiod, see Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 41–52.

⁵³ Parker 1983, 8–9.

⁵⁴ This inscription is known as The Lindian Chronicle (Syll³ 725 = FGrH 532). On the text, Higbie 2003.

⁵⁵ Totti, 1985, Nr. 61. The provenance of this text proved difficult to trace; the text is customarily referred to as ‘Sarapis Oracle for Timainetos’, although it is clearly a programma rather

Sarapis and the Delphic Apollo. Sarapis was an epiphanic deity of miraculous healing, who appeared to his worshippers in a dream. The Delphic Apollo was an oracular divinity, which means that he also was perceived as present in his temple during the period of oracular consultation.

Finally, a fourth text is attested in literary sources, which however expressly state that it was *inscribed* in the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus:⁵⁶

ἀγνὸν χρῆ ναιοῖο θυώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντα
ἔμμεναι· ἀγνεία δ' ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὅσια.

Porphyrios, *De abst.* 2.19.23; Clemens Alex., *Strom.* 5.1.13 p. 334.24 St.

He who goes inside the sweet smelling temple must be pure.
Purity is to think pious thoughts.

Up until 2002, it was universally held that this inscription was as old as the temple of Asclepius at Epidaurus, so the text was dated in the early 4th century BC, which would make this text the earliest inscriptionally attested definition of purity as thinking appropriate thoughts. Furthermore, this text is an elegiac couplet and could be the earliest instance of the epigram as a temple-programma.

However, in 2002, Bremmer argued that the inscription is of a much later date: he takes issue with what he sees as an unusual combination of *hosios* and *hagnos*, and argues that the section of Porphyry's *De Abstinencia*, where this inscription is quoted, does not rely on Theophrastus, as has been previously held.⁵⁷ He asserts that the Epidaurian inscription is not earlier than the turn of our era. Since the publication of his paper, Chaniotis, Robertson, and Mylonopoulos have argued in favour of the 4th c. BC date for this text.⁵⁸ One additional

than an oracle, cf. Petrovic/Petrovic 2006, 177 and Chaniotis 2012, p. 128–9. Further two texts are AP 14.71 and 74, both introduced as 'Pythian oracles'. On these, see Petrovic/Petrovic 2006, 176–7.

56 Porphyrios, *De Abst.* 2.19.23: ἐν γοῦν Ἐπιδαύρῳ προεγγράπτο, ἀγνὸν χρῆ...; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5.1.13: ὅστις ἄρα ἦν ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐπιγράψας τῇ εἰσόδῳ τοῦ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ νεώ· ἀγνὸν χρῆ... I quote Porphyry after Bouffartigue 1979 and Clemens after Früchtel/Stählin/Treu, 1960–1970. This inscription is also quoted by Johannes Bessarion (*In calumniatorem Platonis*) who expressly quotes from Porphyry's second book (3.5.3.18), but provides only the first part of the inscription: καὶ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ δέ φησι προσγεγράφθαι· ἀγνὸν χρῆ ναιοῖο θυώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντα ἔμμεναι (3.5.3.34).

57 Following Bouffartigue 1979, 206.

58 Discussion and date: Chaniotis 1997, p. 154–5 and 2012, 130–1; Robertson 2013; Cf. late 3rd c. BC *Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis*, IG 9. 4. 1299, ll. 33–4 and *EBGR* (2002) no. 15 (*Kernos* 18 [2005] 436–7), where J. Mylonopoulos notes that ἀγνός and ὅσιος are found together in an epigram from Phaistos I discuss above. See also Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 6, 283–4.

piece of evidence in favour of the early date is presented in Sebastian Prignitz' 2014 edition with a commentary of the Epidaurian building inscriptions. These inscriptions list all material and labour expenses for the temple of Asclepius and specifically mention the costs for inscribing of *letters on the temple* as part of the running expenses.⁵⁹

Even if the passage from Porphyry where this inscription is quoted does not go back to Theophrastus, there can be very little doubt that the epigram from Asclepius' temple is the oldest extant cathartic programma in meter and is as old as the Epidaurian temple. Further support for the early date of the inscription can be found in the fact that the first line of the Epidaurian inscription is quoted twice in other extant programmata. The first quote is in an inscription from the sanctuary of either Sarapis or Asclepius in Mytilene. This text is late Hellenistic and expresses the same idea as the Epidaurian text, but in prose: ἀγνὸν πρὸς τέμενος στείχειν ὅσια φρονέοντα 'The one who thinks religiously correct thoughts may proceed to the sanctuary as pure.'⁶⁰ The second is a verbatim quotation in the Rhodian inscription set up at the sanctuary of Sarapis: ἀγνὸν χρὴ ναοῖο θ[υ]ώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντ[α] ἔνμεναι· οὐ λουτροῖ ἁλλὰ νόψ καθαρόν.⁶¹ Chaniotis remarked that this entry regulation combines two texts in two lines: the hexameter and the first word of the pentameter are literal quotations of the Epidaurian *programma*, while the rest of pentameter displays significant similarities with a literary transmitted text which is also associated with the cult of Sarapis.⁶² The Rhodian inscription is, apart from a single letter (ἐνμεναι / ἔμμεναι) identical with Porphyry's quote of the text. This detail is significant, since both Porphyry and the Rhodian inscription attest the odd and very seldom form ναοῖο, whereas Clemens 'corrects' it and provides the following text:

ἀγνὸν χρὴ νηοῖο θυώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντα
ἔμμεναι· ἀγνεῖη δ' ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὅσια.⁶³

Clemens' version of the inscription is ionicized – he replaces the form ναοῖο with a much better attested epic form νηοῖο, and instead of ἀγνεῖα he writes ἀγνεῖη.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Nr. 1 BII, 194–5 ed. Prignitz 2014. Prignitz dates the building of the temple 20 years earlier than generally thought (between 400 and 390 BC).

⁶⁰ *LSCG* Suppl. 82. On identity of the god: Robertson 2013, 231; date: Carbon/Pirenne-Delforge 2012, 176 with n. 59.

⁶¹ *LSCG* Suppl. 108, 4–7. 1st c. AD, Rhodes.

⁶² Chaniotis 1997, 163. The text in question is Totti 1985, Nr. 61.

⁶³ *Strom.* 5.1.13.

⁶⁴ However, in another passage from the same book, Clemens quotes the second part of the inscription and provides the form ἀγνεῖα (*Strom.* 4.22.142): ταύτῃ τοι λελουμένους φασι δεῖν

As quoted by Porphyry and the Rhodian inscription, the Epidaurian couplet displays a number of Homeric forms: the infinitive ἔμμεναι, the genitive singular ending -οιο, and the expression νηὸς θυώδης.⁶⁵ The form ναιοῖο is a genitive of the Doric form ναός with an epic genitive ending -οιο. Whereas all forms of the ionic νηός, including the genitive νηοῖο are attested in early epic poetry, ναιοῖο is extremely rare. Apart from the quotations of the Epidaurian inscription, this form occurs in only three further instances in the entire Greek literature.⁶⁶ In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, the eponymous heroine uses this form in a quotation of a hexameter oracle, which she reads aloud.⁶⁷ The form also occurs in the *Sibylline Oracles*,⁶⁸ and in Gregory of Nazianzus' *Carmina quae spectant ad alios*.⁶⁹

In addition, the adjective θυώδης, which is well attested in literature, but occurs in only eight inscriptions,⁷⁰ is attested in yet another inscription from Epidaurus. In the late fourth, or early third century BC,⁷¹ a certain Isyllus, son of Socrates from Epidaurus, composed (or hired a poet to compose) a hymn for Asclepius and Apollo. In the hymn, Asclepius is praised as the child of Aigla, born in the fragrant precinct (ἐν δὲ θυώδει τεμένει).⁷² It seems possible that this paeon, which was composed in order to be performed at Epidaurus, picks up on the temple inscription by describing the sacred precinct in Epidaurus, where Asclepius was born, as θυώδες.

The temple of Asclepius at Epidaurus was famous for its healing miracles. According to the inscriptionally preserved *iamata*, the sick visitors would spend the night in the temple and the god would heal them or communicate

ἐπὶ τὰς ἱεροποιίας καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ἰέναι, καθαρὸς καὶ λαμπρὸς· καὶ τοῦτο μὲν συμβόλου χάριν γίνεται τὸ ἔξωθεν κεκοσμηθῆναι τε καὶ ἡγνίσθαι, 'ἀγνεῖα δ' ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὅσα'.

⁶⁵ The epithet θυώδης occurs three times in the *Odyssey*, but never with νηός. However, in the Homeric Hymns, it is attested twice with νηός in the Hymn 2 *To Demeter*: 356: θυώδεος ἔνδοθι νηοῦ, 386: νηοῖο προπάροιθε θυώδεος and once in the Hymn 5 *To Aphrodite*: 58: θυώδεα νηὸν ἔδυνεν.

⁶⁶ It is also attested in *IG* 5.2.461 l. 5, an inscriptional epigram from Megalopolis, 2nd c. BC.

⁶⁷ *Lys.* 775.

⁶⁸ 5.433.

⁶⁹ 1572.1.

⁷⁰ *SEG* 51.239 l.1, fragmentary epigram from Rhamnous, 4–3 c BC; *Tit.Cam.* 13, l. 16, dedicatory epigram from Kamiros on Rhodes, 285 BC; *SEG* 54.1569, l. 1, dedicatory epigram from Kuliab area, 3/2 c BC; *SEG* 16.615, col. 2, l. 1, funerary epigram from Ostia, 2nd c. AD; *I. Kourion* 203 l.1, dedicatory epigram from Cyprus, 4th c. AD; *SGO* 17/08/02, l.5, a fragmentary grave epigram from Sidyma; *LSCG* Suppl. 108 l. 5 (see above) and *IG* 4.2.1.128, l. 48 (see below).

⁷¹ Several dates have been proposed for this inscription. See the discussion in Kolde 2003, 257–63 who dates it to the beginning of the third century BC.

⁷² *IG* 4.2.1.128, l. 48.

the cure by appearing to them in a dream.⁷³ This connects the inscription from the temple at Epidauros with the other epigrammatic programmata: In the cases where we know something about the cultic activities in the sanctuaries, or the inscriptions reference it themselves, all epigrammatic programmata were composed for epiphanic divinities. These texts are attested from 4th c. BC and tend to lay a special emphasis on the inner purity by referencing religiously correct thoughts and speech, demanding just behaviour, or simply requiring that the visitors obtain purity of mind. As Andrej Petrovic and I argue in our 2016 book, inner purity as a phenomenon is attested in Greek Religion as early as Hesiod, and we encounter it in various discourses, from Pre-Socratic philosophers, over sympotic poetry, to Athenian drama. However, in the inscriptional evidence, inner purity as a requirement for entering the sacred ground first appears in the 4th century BC.⁷⁴ It is remarkable that the metrical purity regulations stress this aspect of purity so resolutely. Their tendency to address the visitor directly, as well as their placement on the doors of the sanctuary, or on the temple itself, suggest that the implied speaker in these epigrams is the divinity who holds the temple. After all, it is only the all-perceiving god who can assess the visitors' inner state of mind, who can distinguish between the inwardly pure and impure, and dispense awards and punishments in accordance to what it perceives.⁷⁵

Abbreviations

CEG	Hansen, P.A. (ed.) (1983), <i>Carmina epigraphica graeca saeculorum VIII-V a. Chr. n.</i> , Berlin / New York.
FGrH	Jacoby, F. (ed.) (1923ff.), <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , Berlin.
GVI	Peek, W. (ed.) (1955), <i>Griechische Versinschriften I: Grabepigramme</i> , Berlin.
I.Kourion	Mitford, T.B. (ed.) (1971), <i>The Inscriptions of Kourion</i> , Philadelphia.
I.Lindos	Blinkenberg, C. (ed.) (1941), <i>Lindos. Fouilles et recherches, II. Fouilles de l'acropole. Inscriptions</i> , Berlin.
I.Stratonikeia	M.Ç. Şahin (ed.) (1981), <i>Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia</i> , Vol. 1: Panamara, Bonn.
I.Cret.	Guarducci, M. (ed.) (1935–1950), <i>Inscriptiones creticae opera et consilio Friderici Halbherr collectae</i> . 4 vols. Rome.
IG	(1873ff.), <i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> , Berlin.
LSAM	Sokołowski, F. (ed.) (1955), <i>Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure</i> , Paris.

⁷³ On the healing epiphanies, Petridou 2016, 143–62 with bibliography, on *iamata*, LiDonnici 1995.

⁷⁴ Chaniotis 1997: 154–5 and 2012: 130–1, see also Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 280–8.

⁷⁵ On this idea in Greek religious thought, Petrovic/Petrovic 2016, 265–8.

- LSCG Suppl* Sokołowski, F. (ed.) (1969), *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément* Paris.
- SEG* (1923 ff.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden, Amsterdam.
- SGO* Merkelbach, R. / Stauber, J. (eds.) (1998–2004), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, 5 vols, Leipzig / Munich.
- Syll³* Dittenberger, W. (ed.) (1915–1924), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., Leipzig.
- TAM* (1901 ff.), *Tituli Asiae minoris*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.
- Tit. Cam.* Segre, M. / Pugliese Carratelli, G. (eds.) (1949–1951), *Tituli Camirenses*, ASAA 27–29, 141–318.

Bibliography

- Accame, S. (1938), 'Legge Sacra di un tempio rodio', in: *Memorie Ist. Stor. Arch. di Rodi* 3, 69–84.
- Baumbach, M. / Petrovic, A. / Petrovic, I. (eds.) (2010) *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge.
- Bernabé, A. (2005), *Poetae epici graeci testimonia et fragmenta Pars II: Orphicorum et orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta*, fasc. 2, Munich, Leipzig.
- Bile, M. (1988), *Le dialecte crétois ancien*, Paris.
- Bouffartigue, J. (1979), *Porphyre, De L'Abstinence*, Vol. II, Paris.
- Bremmer, J.N. (2002), 'How Old Is the Ideal of Holiness (of Mind) in the Epidaurian Temple Inscription and the Hippocratic Oath?', in: *ZPE* 141, 106–8.
- Bubenik, V. (1989), *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area*, Amsterdam.
- Carbon, M. / Pirenne-Delforge, V. (2012), 'Beyond Greek "Sacred Laws"', in: *Kernos* 25, 163–82.
- Chaniotis, A. (1997), 'Reinheit des Körpers – Reinheit der Seele in den griechischen Kultgesetzen', in: J. Assmann / Th. Sundermeier (eds.), *Schuld, Gewissen und Person*, Gütersloh, 142–79.
- (2012), 'Greek Ritual Purity: From Automatism to Moral Distinctions', in: P. Roesch / U. Simon (eds.), *How Purity is Made*, Wiesbaden, 123–39.
- Day, J. (2010), *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication. Representation and Reperformance*, Cambridge.
- Dyggve, E. / Poulsen, V. (1960), *Lindos. Fouilles de l'acropole 1902–1914 et 1952, 3. Le sanctuaire d'Athana Lindia et l'architecture lindienne. Avec un catalogue des sculptures trouvées sur l'acropole*, 2 vols., Berlin.
- Errington, R.M. (1993), 'Inscriben von Euromos', in: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 21, 15–31.
- Früchtel, L. / Stählin, O. / Treu, U. (eds.) (1960–1970), *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 2 vols., Berlin.
- Gödde, S. (2011), *Euphēmia. Die gute Rede in Kult und Literatur der griechischen Antike*, Heidelberg.
- Halbherr, F. (1890), 'Iscrizioni cretesi', in: *Museo italiano di antichità classica* 3, 559–748.
- Hunter, R. (forthcoming), 'Death of a child: A grief beyond literary?', in: Carey, C. / Kanellou, M. / Petrovic, I. (eds.), *Greek literary epigram*.
- Higbie, C. (2003), *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of Their Past*, Oxford.
- Kähler, H. (1971), 'Die Akropolis von Lindos', in: *AW* 2, 1–12.

- Kolde, A. (2003), *Politique et religion chez Isyllos d'Épidaure*, Basel.
- Koning, H. (2010), *Hesiod: The Other Poet, Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon*, Leiden / Boston.
- Kovacs, D. (1999) *Euripides Vol. IV: Trojan Women, Iphigenia among the Thaurians, Ion, Edited and Translated*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA / London.
- Levi, D. (1921), 'Silloge in corsivo delle iscrizioni metriche cretesi', in: *SIFC* 2, 321–400.
- LiDonnici, L.-R. (ed.) (1995), *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Atlanta.
- Lippolis, E. (1988–1989), 'Il santuario di Athana a Lindo', in: *ASAtene* 66–67, 97–1, 57.
- Martínez Fernández, A. (2006), *Epigramas helenísticos de Creta*, Madrid.
- Mikalson, J. D. (1991), *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy*, Chapel Hill.
- (2010), *Greek Popular Religion in Greek Philosophy*, Oxford.
- Most, G.W. (2006), *Hesiod. Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia, Edited and Translated*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA / London.
- Obryk, M. (2012), *Unterblichkeitsglaube in den Griechischen Versinschriften*, Berlin / Boston.
- Parker, R. (1983), *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- Peels, S. (2014), *Hosios. A semantic study of Greek piety* (diss., Utrecht).
- Petridou, G. (2016), *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*, Oxford.
- Petrovic, A. (2015) "'Sacred Law" in Ancient Greek Religion', in: J. Kindt / E. Eidinow (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion*, Oxford, 339–52.
- Petrovic, A. / Petrovic, I. (2006), 'Look who's Talking Now: Speaker and Communication in Metrical Sacred Regulations', in: E. Stavrianopoulou (ed.), *Ritual and Communication*, Liège, 111–39.
- (2016), *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion. Volume 1: Early Greek religion*, Oxford.
- (2016a) = 'Purity of body and soul in the cult of Athena Lindia: On eastern background of Greek abstentions', in: M. Carbon / V. Pirenne-Delforge, Liège.
- Prignitz, S. (2014), *Bauurkunden und Bauprogramm von Epidauros (400–350). Asklepiostempel. Tholos. Kultbild, Brunnenhaus*, Munich.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. (2001), *Le lamine d'oro orfiche: Istruzioni per il viaggio oltremontano degli iniziati greci*, Milano.
- Radke, G. (1958), 'Psithyrists', in: *RE* 23.2, 1414–15.
- (1958a), 'Psithyros', in: *RE* 23.2, 1415–16.
- Robertson, N. (2013), 'The concept of purity in Greek sacred laws', in: Ch. Frevel / Ch. Nihan, (eds.), *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean and Ancient Judaism*, Leiden / Boston, 195–244.
- Thumb, A. (1901), *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der Koine*, Strassburg.
- Totti, M. (1985), *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis- und Sarapisreligion*, Hildesheim.
- Tzifopoulos, Y. (2010), *'Paradise' Earned. The Bacchic-Orphic Gold Lamellae of Crete*, Cambridge / London.
- Usener, H. (1904), 'Psithyros', in: *RhM* 59, 623–4.
- Voutiras, E. (1995), 'Zu einer metrischen Inschrift aus Euromos', in: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 24, 15–19.
- (1998) 'Nachtrag zu einer metrischen Inschrift aus Euromos', in: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 30, 148.

- Wachter, R. (2010), 'The origin of epigram as speaking object', in: Baumbach / Petrovic / Petrovic (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, Cambridge, 250–60.
- Wilhelm, A. (1980), *Griechische Epigramme, aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von Helmut Engelmann und Klaus Wundsam*, Bonn.
- Wriedt Sørensen, L. / Pentz, P. (1992), *Lindos, 4, 2. Excavations and surveys in southern Rhodes. The post-Mycenaean periods until Roman times and the medieval period*, Copenhagen.

